

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **9 March 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-13, 15-17, 19-21, 23-26, 28, 29, 31, 32, and 34. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-13, 15-17, 19-21, 23-26, 28, 29, 31, 32, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maier et al. (USPN 5,625,815 hereinafter “Maier”), in view of Green et al. (USPN 6,041,310 hereinafter “Green”). Claims 3, 11 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maier, in view of Green, and further in view of Cochrane et al. (USPN 6,041,310 hereinafter “Cochrane”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 9, 17, 26, 29, and 32 were rejected as being unpatentable over Maier in view of Green. Applicant respectfully points out that Maier teaches a transaction manager that creates audit entries for each transaction to achieve higher database availability during structural changes, wherein a “transaction” refers to a structural change operation including a Move Partition procedure, a Split Partition procedure, a Move Partition Boundary procedure, and a Create Index procedure (see Maier, col. 1, lines 53-56, see Maier col. 2, lines 34-46, and see Maier, col. 4, lines 10-12).

In contrast, the present invention discloses “selectively” creating an audit record for accesses to a relational database (see page 3, lines 10-14 of the instant application). Specifically, the present invention teaches creating audit records for rows that are accessed by queries that satisfy certain auditing conditions. Hence, generation of an audit record can depend on the value of a certain field in a row in the database (see page 7, lines 24 - page 8, line 2 of the instant application). For example, the present invention can generate audit records only for employee records with salary values greater than \$100,000. Since Maier does not examine values of fields in rows, Maier cannot do this. The present invention is advantageous because resources, such as processor time and storage space, are

saved by not auditing operations or queries that an organization deems unimportant. Furthermore, because the audit records only contain information an organization considers important, searching the audit records will use less resources, such as employee time or processor time.

Maier discloses an audit filter, but does not disclose an audit filter that records rows based on the value of a field in a row. Applicant respectfully asks Examiner to point out precisely where Maier audits a row based on a value of a field within a row, and how the system in Maier can for example generate audit records for employee records with salary values greater than \$100,000.

There is nothing in Maier or Green, either separately or in concert, which suggests or implies selectively auditing user accesses to a relational database based on the values of data being accessed. Furthermore, Maier teaches away from selective auditing (see Maier, col. 2, lines 34-38, and see Maier, col. 4, lines 10-12) and understandably so as implementing Maier's teaching requires a complete audit to ensure consistency of the database (see Maier, col. 2, lines 58-67).

Accordingly, Applicant has amended Independent claims 1, 9, 17, 26, 29, and 32 to clarify that the present invention creates an audit record only for rows in relational tables accessed by the query and satisfying the auditing condition. These amendments find support on page 7, lines 24 - page 8, line 2 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, 17, 26, and 29 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3, 5, 7-8, and 25, which depend upon claim 1, claims 11-13, and 15-16, which depend upon claim 9, claims 19-21, and 23-24, which depend upon claim 17, claim 28, which depends on claim 26, claim 31, which depends on claim 29, and claim 34, which depends on claim 32 are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: 26 April 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com